

Docket No.: 216904US2

OBLON SPIVAK MCCLELLAND MAIER NEUSTADT P.C.

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

RE: Application Serial No.: 10/006,377

Applicants: Kazunari TONAMI, et al.

Filing Date: December 10, 2001

For: IMAGE-PROCESSING DEVICE USING

QUANTIZATION THRESHOLD VALUES ...

Group Art Unit: 2624

Examiner: LEE, TOMMY D.

SIR:

Attached hereto for filing are the following papers:

ELECTION RESPONSE

Our credit card payment form in the amount of \$0.00 is attached covering any required fees. In the event any variance exists between the amount enclosed and the Patent Office charges for filing the above-noted documents, including any fees required under 37 C.F.R 1.136 for any necessary Extension of Time to make the filing of the attached documents timely, please charge or credit the difference to our Deposit Account No. 15-0030. Further, if these papers are not considered timely filed, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for the necessary extension of time. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

James J. Kulbaski

Registration No. 34,648

Customer Number

22850

(703) 413-3000 (phone) (703) 413-2220 (fax)

I:\ATTY\RAR\RESTRICTIONS (2006)\216904us\cvrltr.doc

Ronald A. Rudder, Ph.D. Registration No. 45,618

OIPE 4015 FEB 27 2006 W

DOCKET NO. 216904US2

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF:

KAZUNARI TONAMI ET AL.

:EXAMINER: LEE, TOMMY D.

SERIAL NO: 10/006,377

FILED: DECEMBER 10, 2001

:GROUP ART UNIT: 2624

FOR: IMAGE-PROCESSING DEVICE USING OUANTIZATION THRESHOLD VALUES ...

ELECTION RESPONSE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313

SIR:

In response to the Election of Species Requirement dated January 27, 2006,
Applicants elect with traverse Claims 1-38. Applicants make this election based on the understanding that Applicants are not prejudiced against filing one or more divisional applications that cover the non-elected claims.

Applicants respectfully traverse this Election of Species Requirement for the reason that MPEP § 803 states:

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.

The claims of the present invention would appear to be part of an overlapping search area. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse the Election of Species Requirement on the grounds that a search and examination of the entire application would not place a *serious*

Application No: 10/006,377

Reply to Election Requirement dated January 27, 2006

burden on the Examiner, whereas it would clearly be burdensome on Applicants to be required to file, prosecute and maintain separate applications and patents on the identified.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the requirement to elect a single group be withdrawn, and that a full examination on the merits of Claims 1-64 be conducted.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Ronda C. Russe

James J. Kulbaski

Registration No. 34,648

Ronald A. Rudder, Ph.D.

Registration No. 45,618

CUSTOMER NUMBER 22850

Tel. No.: (703) 413-3000 Fax No.: (703) 413-2220

JJK:RAR:clh

I:\ATTY\RAR\RESTRICTIONS (2006)\216904US\ELECT.DOC